

1
2
3
4
5 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
6 FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
7

8 IN RE: TFT-LCD (FLAT PANEL) ANTITRUST
9 LITIGATION

No. M 07-1827 SI

MDL No. 1827

10 This Order Relates to:

11 All indirect-purchaser actions.
12
13
14

**ORDER DENYING MOTION TO ALTER
OR AMEND JUDGMENT**

15 Class members and objectors Barbara Cochran, Kevin Luke, Geri Maxwell, Maria Marshall,
16 Wayne Marshall, and Gerri Marshall filed a motion to alter and amend the July 11, 2012 Order
17 Granting Final Approval of Combined Class, Parens Patriae, and Governmental Entity Settlements;
18 Final Judgment of Dismissal With Prejudice. In the July 11, 2012 order, the Court approved the total
19 amount allocated for seven settlements, but did not approve a plan of distribution, as the seven
20 settlements represented only a partial settlement of the case. The objectors, who previously objected
21 to final approval of the seven settlements, contend that *Dennis v. Kellogg Co.*, __ F.3d __, 2012 WL
22 3800230 (9th Cir. 2012), requires the parties to identify the potential *cy pres* recipients in the settlement
23 agreements.

24 The Court finds that this contention lacks merit, and accordingly the motion to alter or amend
25 is DENIED. The plan of distribution for all of the settlement monies, including the settlements that were
26 the subject of the July 11, 2012 order, is contained in the three more recent settlements with the last
27 remaining defendants (AUO, LG Display, and Toshiba defendants). A hearing on final approval of
28 those settlements is scheduled for November 29, 2012. If they wish to do so, the objectors may object


1 to the plan of distribution by filing an objection by October 9, 2012. *See* www.LCDclass.com.

2 The objectors also request that the Court amend the July 11, 2012 order to state that one of the
3 objections lodged by Geri Maxwell and the Marshalls (namely, that class members should receive treble
4 damages before any money is distributed to separate recipients), was adopted by the Court. In support
5 of this request, the objectors cite the distribution plan proposed in the motion for preliminary approval
6 of the settlements with AUO, LG Display, and Toshiba. However, as stated *supra*, the July 11, 2012
7 order did not approve a plan of allocation, and thus it would be incorrect to amend that order in the
8 manner requested by the objectors.

9 This order resolves Docket No. 6230.

10
11 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

12
13 Dated: October 1, 2012

14 
15 _____
16 SUSAN ILLSTON
17 United States District Judge
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28